

**Superior Court of CA, County of Siskiyou**  
**PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROJECT**

**PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT REPORTS OUTLINE**

July 1, 2002

**Document Overview**

This document outlines the potential contents for a series of annual performance measurement reports. Even though not every item identified here will be included in a single report each year, potential items are documented. Specifically, the purpose of the outline is to provide guidance for constructing the Siskiyou County Superior Court performance measurement system by:

- describing the types of policy and operational questions that should be addressed in a series of performance assessment reports;
- showing how data and performance information obtained from a variety of sources might be integrated into short documents; and
- illustrating the format for a report focused on domestic violence (DV) case processing.

**Report Outline**

1. Performance Assessment Summary

A. General Performance Ratings

B. Areas Needing Improvement

C. Performance Agenda For the Coming Year

2. Purpose and Approach

A. Purpose

(1) Provide summary of general assessment of performance of Siskiyou County Superior Court by public, policy-makers, justice system partners, and Court personnel in order to help improve performance.

(2) Highlight changes in perceptions of performance.

- (3) Document significant performance improvement activities in light of direction specified in the Community Focused Strategic Plan.
- (4) Review performance relative to local government and California State Court system goals.
- (5) Provide foundation for a future performance improvement agenda.

B. Approach

- (1) Overview of history and mechanics of the Siskiyou County Superior Court performance measurement project.
- (2) Addressing essential performance questions.
- (3) Use of multiple information sources.
- (4) Use of Community Focused Strategic Plan.
- (5) Review specific work processes targeted for assessment the previous year.

3. How is the Court Meeting the Goals Articulated in the Strategic Plan?

A. Specific Questions and Data Sources

B. Presentation Format

- (1) Review of services and activities in light of Strategic Plan goals and values.
- (2) Summary Table.

4. How Satisfied Are the Public in General With the Performance of the Siskiyou County Superior Court?

A. Specific Questions and Data Sources

B. Presentation Format

- (1) Answers to each question using data from multiple sources.

- (2) Comparisons to previous years, highlighting changes, and explaining potential reasons for changes when appropriate.
- 5. Assessment of specific work processes such as DV case processing
  - A. Review of the history of the recent DV effort
    - (1) Overview of the scope of effort in light of prior staffing
    - (2) Links to Strategic Plan (especially values, principles, strategic issues.)
    - (3) Review of steps and activities involved in recent DV efforts
  - B. Inventory of DV process goals
  - C. Answers to critical performance measurement questions
  - D. Future activity
  - E. Supporting data summary

# **Superior Court of CA, County of Siskiyou PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT**

## **EXAMPLE: RECRUITMENT AND HIRING PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT REPORT**

July 1, 2002

### **Overview**

Over the past few years in the Siskiyou county Superior Court has recruited, hired, and trained [ ] new court clerks or about 30% of its current total force of [ ] positions. The sizable increase in force has been a result of court consolidation and the move to state level court funding which has allowed the Court to begin to meet a variety of previously unmet needs. Moreover, at the same time, the Siskiyou County Superior Court has substantially restructured operations and re-deployed staff in an attempt to better meet community and policy-maker expectations for effective court service as articulated in the Siskiyou County Superior Court Community Focused Strategic Plan. Also, substantial improvements in recruitment, hiring, and training processes have been initiated as part of the recent effort.

This document: describes the Siskiyou County Superior Court's goals for staff recruitment and hiring, and answers critical performance measurement questions about:

- the mechanics and results of staff selection;
- the fairness of the hiring process;
- how the deployment of new staff supports court service delivery strategies suggested in the Strategic Plan; and
- the adequacy of the organizational infrastructure designed to support recruitment and hiring.

The information presented here is being collected as part of the Siskiyou County Superior Court performance evaluation project, an on-going effort initiated in 2001 with financial assistance provided by a grant from the Administrative Office of the California State Courts. The purpose of the project is to design, construct and institutionalize an innovative performance indicator system that reflects public, policy-maker, and court personnel expectations for effective court service. The requirements of the performance indicator system include a need to:

- evaluate the success of Siskiyou County Superior Court Community Focused Strategic Plan implementation;

- be comprehensive enough to capture the full scope, volume, and complexity of work being completed throughout the entire Superior Court;
- fully reflect the Court and community's values and expectations; and
- provide readily assessable information about Superior Court effectiveness which can be used for planning, budgeting, training needs assessment, public information exchange, and policy and program development.

## **Recruitment and Hiring Process Goals**

The goals of recruitment and hiring, as shown in Figure 1, focus on assuring that the Siskiyou County Superior Court selects staff with personal integrity that are capable of learning and applying service skills that support the values and mission of the Court as captured in the Strategic Plan.

## **Answers to Critical Performance Measurement Questions**

Does the Superior Court hire staff with integrity, who have good communication and problem solving skills, and are committed to the values and philosophy of the Superior Court?

Public opinion and Court personnel surveys conducted in support of the preparation of the Community Focused Strategic Plan stressed that successful court staff should not only have integrity but also:

- have the capacity to learn new processes and approaches to the work of the court; and
- have the ability to deal with the stress associated with processing high case volumes.

In addition, the public, policy-makers, and Siskiyou County Superior Court personnel often have stressed that the Court in general should have a workforce capable of meeting the diverse needs of Siskiyou County, including the needs of individuals from diverse racial and ethnic groups visiting, working, and living in the community.

**FIGURE 1: RECRUITMENT AND HIRING GOALS**

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>GOAL ONE</b>   | <p><b>Improve court services by hiring competent and successful court personnel throughout the entire Superior Court.</b></p> <p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• hiring people with the capability to work with diverse types of people;</li> <li>• hiring people with the capability to deal with the stress associated with processing high case volumes;</li> <li>• hiring people who are willing to learn new processes and approaches to doing the work of the court, and have strong written and oral communication skills;</li> <li>• hiring people who are willing to work in groups and willing to use a variety of problem-solving approaches; and</li> <li>• hiring people who will have long-term careers with the Siskiyou County Superior Court, as well as people who will move from the Superior Court to other courts and justice organizations, and careers.</li> </ul> |
| <b>GOAL TWO</b>   | <p><b>Recruit and select a workforce capable of serving a culturally diverse community.</b></p> <p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• attracting numerous qualified applicants for each available position;</li> <li>• attracting applicants who have personal values and philosophies that support the values and philosophy of the Superior Court; and</li> <li>• selecting a workforce that can meet the diverse needs of Siskiyou County.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>GOAL THREE</b> | <p><b>Operate a fair, open and non-biased recruitment and hiring process.</b></p> <p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• seeking the views of judges, staff, and the community in recruitment and hiring decisions;</li> <li>• providing applicants an overview of the philosophy, structure and organization, and organizational culture of the Siskiyou County Superior Court;</li> <li>• using staff and supervisors to help evaluate the effectiveness of selection instruments to screen for potential problems; and</li> <li>• using validated, standardized, and consistently applied selection standards.</li> </ul>  |

**[[[Remember that this is fiction for the most part. This is an example of what a report can look like.]]]**

A brief review of statistics describing clerk candidates recruited during the three hiring waves completed after the unifications of the Court show that:

- ❑ eighteen percent of all applicants were male, while fourteen percent of all applicants identified themselves as being either Hispanic, African-American, Asian, or Native American; and
- ❑ twenty-three percent of the sixty individuals offered positions as a result of the three recent hiring efforts were male, and thirteen percent were either Hispanic, African-American, Asian, or Native American.

Comparable figures for the Siskiyou County population as a whole are forty-nine percent male, and a total of     percent either Hispanic (   %), African-American (   %), Asian (   %), or Native American (   %). Excluding the Court, the Siskiyou County Government workforce is     female, and     percent Hispanic (   %), African-American (   %), Asian (   %), or Native American.

In addition, review of new clerk performance to date using supervisor comments, discipline records, and supervisor and peer focus groups indicate that:

- to date, of the sixty recruits offered positions, four turned down the offer, fifty-five are now in the final phases of training or are serving as clerks, and all are performing at ratings of standard or above standard, while three new staff have been promoted, while three others have been subject to disciplinary procedures;
- the vast majority of recent recruits are decent, hard-working, and want to learn to do the job well; and
- clerks recently hired, in contrast to recruits of ten or twenty years ago, lack significant previous work and “real-life” experience, even though they have had more formal education, and thus need more practical training and opportunities to develop confidence in difficult situations.

Is the Siskiyou County Superior Court recruitment and hiring process viewed by applicants, judges, court personnel and the public as being fair, thorough, and skills-oriented?

Court staff and judges responsible for the recent recruitment and hiring effort, as well as justice agency partners, reported that they were favorably impressed by the Court’s use of:

- advertising and face-to-face recruitment;
- comprehensive reading, vocabulary, oral and written presentation, and psychological testing;
- background investigations; and
- class-room and field training.

Moreover, since the beginning of the year court representatives are active year-round in recruitment activities such as attending job fairs at local colleges to advertise employment opportunities and contact potential position candidates. Potential candidate lists are maintained and those who have expressed interest in the Court are notified of testing opportunities when they emerge. The Siskiyou County Superior Court web-site provides information about the Court and employment opportunities. Also, in an on-going effort to reach diverse audiences of potential court personnel, employment opportunities are advertised in magazines, newspapers and other publications targeting particular racial and ethnic groups.

In addition, focus groups with staff recently hired by the Court show that:

- applicants used a variety of mechanisms to find-out about both job opportunities and the Superior Court work environment, including talking, informally, with judges and staff and with personnel at other government organizations, via announcements posted on the internet, or at job fairs;
- recruits selected the Superior Court rather than other numerous job opportunities because they were attracted to working in a rural county, salaries are comparatively good, the size and philosophy of the Court would opportunities do to a variety of different types of, the philosophy of the Court to fit the recruits personal philosophy, and the Superior work setting appears to be professional but also friendly and employee supportive;
- testing and selection processes were viewed as being thorough, fair, and job performance oriented;
- training was seen as “reality” rather than textbook based and thus practical and useful, essential to getting a good understanding of appropriate procedures and job performance expectations for court staff, and as a forum for providing opportunities to get to know co-workers;
- field training was viewed by recruits as being supportive, confidence building, and practical.



Suggested improvements to staff recruitment and training identified by recent applicants include:

- develop more accessible mechanisms for informing applicants about their progressing during in each step in recruitment and training;
- provide a months notice before a job start date;
- broadly target a potential audience of applicants that includes people with very diverse education and experience backgrounds as well as people with a court background and interest;
- expand internet based advertising and information dissemination about Siskiyou County and the Superior Court;
- provide, up-front, a clear time-frame for recruit selection and training;
- increase opportunities for scenario based training and field training; and
- increase team-building training.

Does the deployment of new staff promote the Superior Court's service delivery strategy?

In general, recent hiring and recruitment efforts have resulted in the Superior Court being able to increase service delivery coverage and court visibility throughout Siskiyou County. In particular, following the strategic direction detailed in the Community Focused Strategic Plan new staff are doing X, Y, Z, etc., etc.

Does the Siskiyou County Superior Court's infrastructure efficiently and effectively support the recruitment and hiring process?

Using the assessment tool included here as Attachment A, a comprehensive review of the technology, planning, facilities, management, and other hard and soft infrastructure needed to support Court recruitment and hiring was conducted by project staff. The assessment, which includes interviews with judges administrators, supervisors and staff, revealed that:

- previous job experience, even if not court related, should be an important applicant screening criteria;
- customer service and listening skills are important attributes of court service that should receive greater emphasis in staff recruitment and training;

- new recruits are receiving good training in X, Y, and Z but need better training in A, B, C;
- there may be advantages to recruiting older staff – people 23 or older – and the advantages and disadvantages of such a recruitment strategy should be investigated;
- balance the importance of education and practical experience in staff recruitment – raised education standards might be at the expense of other skills;
- explore the possibilities of providing signing bonuses to new recruits;
- increase training that builds staff confidence when confronted by situations that involve anger and emotional stress;
- more carefully document recruit performance;
- develop a list of warning signs to identify new staff that might need more targeted training and support;
- encourage and reward risk-taking and decisiveness;
- increase writing skills testing and training;
- increase opportunities for new staff to get to know different parts of the community and individuals within the community; and
- establish more effective links between training and management staff – training staff appear to be unaware of command staff training priorities while training staff are sometimes uncertain about how their feedback is used by management.

### **Future Activity**

Lisa – this might include a description of anticipated performance evaluation activity for the next year.

### **Supporting Data**

**TABLE 1: PROFILE OF APPLICANT PROGRESS**

| Hiring Step   | Percentage of all 2002 Applicants |             |              | Percentage of all 2001 2 <sup>nd</sup> Hiring Applicants |             |              | Percentage of all 2001 2 <sup>nd</sup> Hiring Applicants |            |             |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------|--------------|--|-------------|--------------|--|------------|-------------|
|   | Total                             | Male        | Female       | Total  | Male        | Female       | Total  | Male       | Female      |
| Applications Received                                   | 100%<br>(228)                     | 19%<br>(44) | 81%<br>(184) | 100%<br>(417)  | 18%<br>(74) | 82%<br>(343) | 100%<br>(277)  |            |             |
| Applicant Failed to Meet Minimum Standards              | 14%<br>(31)                       | 3%<br>(6)   | 11%<br>(25)  | 16%<br>(67)  | 2%<br>(9)   | 14%<br>(58)  | 12%<br>(33)  | 1%<br>(4)  | 11%<br>(29) |
| Applicant Invited to Testing but:                       |                                   |             |              |  |             |              |  |            |             |
| Did not respond to Invitation                           | 15%<br>(34)                       | 1%<br>(3)   | 14%<br>(31)  | 10%<br>(43)  | 3%<br>(11)  | 8%<br>(32)   | 19%<br>(52)  | 3%<br>(8)  | 16%<br>(44) |
| Canceled or did not appear for testing appointment      | 18%<br>(42)                       | 3%<br>(7)   | 15%<br>(35)  | 6%<br>(23)   | 2%<br>(7)   | 10%<br>(40)  | 17%<br>(47)  | 2%<br>(6)  | 15%<br>(40) |
| Left testing  | <1%<br>(1)                        | --          | --           | --   | --          | --           | <1%<br>(1)   | --         | <1%<br>(1)  |
| Applicant tested but:                                   |                                   |             |              |  |             |              |  |            |             |
| Failed reading and/or writing skills comprehensive test | 4%<br>(8)                         | <1%<br>(1)  | 3%<br>(7)    | 5%<br>(21)   | 1%<br>(3)   | 4%<br>(18)   | 5%<br>(13)   | 1%<br>(1)  | 4%<br>(12)  |
| Failed oral interview                                   | 10%<br>(22)                       | 1%<br>(3)   | 8%<br>(19)   | 14%<br>(60)  | 3%<br>(13)  | 11%<br>(47)  | 14%<br>(40)  | 4%<br>(10) | 10%<br>(30) |
| Failed application verification                         | 5%<br>(12)                        | 2%<br>(4)   | 4%<br>(8)    | no data  | no data     | no data      | 16%<br>(43)  | 6%<br>(43) | 10%<br>(29) |
| Applicant Discontinued after background check           | 17%<br>(40)                       | 7%<br>(15)  | 11%<br>(25)  | 14%<br>(58)  | 2%<br>(9)   | 12%<br>(48)  | 6%<br>(14)   | 2%<br>(6)  | 3%<br>(8)   |
| Applicant Offered Position                              | 8%<br>(19)                        | 2%<br>(5)   | 6%<br>(14)   | 5%<br>(21)   | 1%<br>(4)   | 4%<br>(17)   | 7%<br>(20)   | 2%<br>(5)  | 5%<br>(15)  |

**TABLE 2: HIRING ACTIVITY SUMMARY**

| <b>Activity</b>                         | <b>Description of Activity</b> | <b>Time-Frame</b> |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Decision to Hire Made                |                                | Month 1           |
| 2. Job Qualifications Set               |                                | Etc.              |
| 3. Job Posted                           |                                |                   |
| 4. Process Scheduled                    |                                |                   |
| 5. Applications Reviewed                |                                |                   |
| 6. Applicants Notified                  |                                |                   |
| 7. Testing Scheduled                    |                                |                   |
| 8. Initial Applicant Testing            |                                |                   |
| 9. Test Results Assessment              |                                |                   |
| 10. Supervisor Applicant Review         |                                |                   |
| 11. Background investigators trained    |                                |                   |
| 12. Background investigations conducted |                                |                   |
| 13. Background information reviewed     |                                |                   |
| 14. Management staff candidate review   |                                |                   |
| 15. Conditional job offers extended     |                                |                   |
| 16. Phase II testing                    |                                |                   |
| 17. Job Offers                          |                                |                   |
| 18. Employment initiation               |                                |                   |
| 19. Class work assignment               |                                |                   |
| 20. Field training assignment           |                                |                   |
| 21. Mini-Skills Academy Assignment      |                                |                   |
| 22. Completion of training              |                                |                   |

**ATTACHMENT A: RECRUITMENT AND HIRING  
INFRASTRUCTURE ASSESSMENT**

**Superior Court of CA, County of Siskiyou  
Performance Assessment Project:  
Strategic Plan Implications Summary**

July 1, 2002

**1. Trends Summary (See attached trends assessment work-sheets)**

**2. Strategic Issues, Goals, and Objectives Modifications**

**3. New Priority Project List (See attached priority project work-sheets).**

**4. Budget Implications Summary**

Staffing Allocations:

One Time Costs (e.g., training):

Technology, Equipment, Facilities:

**Superior Court of CA, County of Siskiyou**  
**Performance Assessment Project:**  
**Priority Project Description Template**

July 1, 2002

| Project Description:                 |   |                             |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <u>Goals and Outcomes:</u><br><br>1. | <u>Implementation Activities:</u><br><br>1. | <u>Start and End Dates:</u> |

**FISCAL YEAR 2003-2004  
BUDGET CHANGE REQUEST PACKAGE  
BUDGET CHANGE REQUEST QUESTIONS**

**Example of a Successful Budget Change Request**

|   |                                      |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Trial Court:                                |                                      |
| Program: <b>Family and Children</b>         | Priority Number <u>2</u> of <u>6</u> |
| Title of Request: <b>Bilingual Mediator</b> | Extraordinary Request _____ or _____ |
| Primary Contact:                            | E-Mail Address:<br>Telephone Number: |
| Program Contact:                            | E-Mail Address:<br>Telephone Number: |

The following is a series of questions that will be used to analyze the court's budget change request. Please provide complete answers to all questions.

**A. Nature of the Request**

- 1. What is the court requesting? Please include the total dollar amount requested, number and type of positions, any offset and a narrative that provides a thorough description of the request.**

The court is requesting a total of \$268,617, which includes \$185,995 in one-time funding. The request is for three positions, one permanent ongoing bilingual family mediator and two one-year limited-term bilingual family mediators. This amount includes additional items of expense for equipment totaling \$4,850. The requested funding will provide bilingual mediation orientation, specialized parent education for separating parents, and child custody mediation sessions. The two limited-term positions will process the case backlog and the two ongoing positions will process on going new cases. The requested positions will perform approximately 840 mediation sessions impacting over 700 monolingual Spanish families. There is not an offset included in this request.

- 2. Describe the reason for the request. Please address the following in your response: Fully describe the extent of the problem/need; Explain the public need; Indicate how this problem/need varies from a "normal" or acceptable situation; State how many individuals/cases are impacted; and, if the request is a result of recent legislation, cite the legislation including the statute and bill number.**

Funding for bilingual family mediation is needed because the court is unable to meet the growing number of monolingual Spanish families who require custody mediation. According to the United States Census Bureau, the Hispanic



population in the county has grown from 15,941 in 1995 to 29,416 in 2000, which is an 84.5% increase during this five-year period.

With the rapid growth of the Hispanic population in this county, the Family court Services office is experiencing growth in the number of mediation referrals for monolingual Spanish speakers. The increase in population growth in the county supports the increase in demand for bilingual mediation services. The demand for bilingual mediation services has also increased because of education programs designed to inform underserved populations of available court services which has resulted in an increase in the use of court services.

On average the bilingual mediator is able to provide mediation sessions for 280 clients annually. However, because of increasing case complexity and the increase amount of time necessary for each mediation session, the number of cases that the bilingual mediator can complete varies annually.

The chart below illustrates the increasing caseload and backlog of bilingual mediation cases, the number of cases processed by the one existing full time bilingual mediator and the resulting cumulative backlog of cases.

| <b>Case History</b>   |             |             |             |             |             |             |  |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
|   | <b>1996</b> | <b>1997</b> | <b>1998</b> | <b>1999</b> | <b>2000</b> | <b>2001</b> | <b>Using<br/>Average<br/>Caseload*</b> |
| <b>New Cases (a)</b>  | 290         | 335         | 365         | 425         | 495         | 640         | 640                                    |
| <b>Backlog from<br/>Previous Year<br/>(b)</b>   | N/A         | 5           | 40          | 103         | 245         | 480         | 480                                    |
| <b>Total Cases<br/>(a) + (b) = (c)</b>  | 290         | 340         | 405         | 528         | 740         | 1120        | 1120                                   |
| <b>Cases<br/>Processed (d)</b>  | 285         | 300         | 302         | 283         | 260         | 250         | 280                                    |
| <b>Cases<br/>Exceeding<br/>Resources<br/>(Backlog)<br/>(c) – (d) = (e)</b>  | 5           | 40          | 103         | 245         | 480         | 870         | 840                                    |
| *For purposes of this request we will be using 280 as our figure for cases processed. This figure represents the average cases that have been processed over a six-year period and provides a better measurement of how many bilingual cases actually can be processed annually. The corresponding figure of 840 cases that exceed current resources will be used throughout the request. |             |             |             |             |             |             |  |

Due to the increase in cases requiring bilingual mediation services and the limited resources the court has available, the wait time for bilingual mediation services is in excess of 100 days whereas the standard waiting period for non-bilingual mediation services is 21 days.

The lack of a bilingual mediator to serve this population compromises the court's ability to provide equal access to justice for all populations. Individuals that require bilingual mediation services do not receive services within the same time as afforded to other litigants. By not providing adequate services the court is failing to meet the requirements of the Family Code §3160 that mandates that all contested custody and visitation disputes go to child custody mediation, and that all courts provide, free of charge, mediation services for disputing parties.

**3. How will the funding requested address the problem/need? Indicate how the problem will be mitigated as a result of the requested funding.**

The requested funding and accompanying positions will address the problem by promoting the following:

- Allowing monolingual Spanish families the same access to justice as English speaking families by providing services to over 700 families annually. (840 mediation sessions)
- Decreasing the wait time for a scheduled mediation session from a minimum of 100 days to 21 days.
- Eliminating the backlog of 480 mediation cases.
- Processing the 360 new cases to minimize the possibility of case backlog occurring in the future<sup>1</sup>.
- Expediting the Spanish-speaking families' process through the court process.
- Increasing public trust and confidence in the court system for all citizens especially those who are underserved.
- Assisting in eliminating bias in the courts.

**B. Background History**

**1. Have you made any similar request since the enactment of State Trial Court Funding (FY 1998-1999)? Include any requests for grant funding or other**

---

<sup>1</sup> For 2001, 640 new cases required mediation and 280 cases received mediation services. (640 – 280 = 360 new cases requiring mediation services.)

**funding sources the court has pursued. Please address the following for each previous request:**

- (a) What was the nature of the request and when was the request submitted?**
- (b) What was the outcome of the request?**
- (c) If recommended by the Judicial Council, was the request funded by the State?**
- (d) If yes, how much funding and how many positions, by classification were received?**
- (e) How did the court use the funds? If the funds were redirected to another area of court operations not reflected in the original request, please explain why.**

The court has not made a similar request since the enactment of Trial Court Funding.

### **C. Justification**

Please answer the following questions providing quantitative data where necessary to support and substantiate your request to the maximum extent possible. If a question is not applicable indicate the reason why in the response.

- 1. Indicate both the total dollars that are currently being expended and the number of positions, by classification, that currently exist in this program area and explain how the work is currently being completed (e.g., contracted services, extra-help, staff overtime, work not performed, etc.). Use data from the Workload Analysis, if applicable.**

The Family Court Services Division is currently staffed as follows:

*1 Family Court Services Director  
1 Office Assistant I  
3 Family Mediators  
1 Bilingual Family Mediator*

*The total dollars that are currently expended in the program is \$705,566.*

The family court services director oversees and coordinates the work and activities of the program. One clerical support staff person is assigned to assist with the clerical duties of the office.

The three mediators, who do not perform bilingual mediation, are currently completing 975 child custody/visitation mediations annually or 325 mediations per position. The bilingual mediator provides on average 280 mediation sessions annually.

Using the average caseload, the 2001 data indicates that there was a need for 1120 (new cases plus the backlog) bilingual mediation sessions. With current resources the court was unable to meet bilingual caseload demands, leaving 840 mediation cases that are delayed, postponed or not conducted.

The court did not have the resources to use overtime, extra-help or other measures to process these cases; therefore, the work went uncompleted.

- 2. Describe in detail how current workload and/or existing services are impacted. If backlog statistics are cited remember to exclude workload that is currently being processed or workload that can be processed in a reasonable or statutorily required length of time. Consequences should be discussed in terms of delays in providing service, or an inability to provide the quality or the level of service required.**

The court currently experiences a delay in providing mediation services. Backlog is created primarily due to two reasons. The first is the courts inability to provide the number of mediation sessions required. This is due to the increasing demand for services. The second reason is the inability of staff to devote the additional time required to conduct bilingual mediation sessions, as case complexity is greater in bilingual cases.

Spanish language cases can take about one-third more time to process than English language cases<sup>2</sup>. This is due in part to the fact that parent orientation is conducted at the time of the first appointment rather than in a group setting. This practice was established in order to better serve the clients. Often work schedules are not amenable to the hours we conduct group orientation. Spanish language cases also often take longer because parents do not have access to adequate childcare and children often accompany their parent to the mediation sessions thus lengthening the time of the family court services sessions. Finally, language barriers can impede referrals for other services and case coordination.

The following chart depicts the cumulative backlog that has resulted.

| Case History                               |      |      |      |      |      |      |                        |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------------------------|
|  | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | Using Average Caseload |
| <b>Cases Exceeding Resources (Backlog)</b> | 5    | 40   | 103  | 245  | 480  | 870  | 840                    |

\*To view the complete Case History Chart see page 2

Due to the increase in cases requiring bilingual mediation services and the limited resources the court has available, the wait time for bilingual mediation has been a minimum of 100 days whereas the standard waiting period for non-bilingual

---

<sup>2</sup> Between 1996 – 2001, non-bilingual mediators processed on average 325 cases whereas the bilingual mediator processed an average of 280 cases or 67% of the caseload of a non-bilingual mediator.

mediation services is 21 days. The end result is that a significant number of monolingual Spanish speaking families received different or unequal services.

**3. If the court is currently absorbing additional costs for the program or service, explain why the court cannot continue to do so.**

The court is not absorbing additional costs for this program.

**4. Explain why a reallocation of staff or other resources cannot address this problem/need.**

The court does not have staff that can perform the functions of a bilingual mediator so a reallocation of staff is not an option.

The court only has a minimal amount of funds available in reserves (approximately two months of operating expenses). Therefore, it would not be a prudent decision for the court to reallocate reserves for this purpose.

The court explored other resolutions, however, they were not economically feasible. For example, the court considered utilizing certified interpreters for family court mediation. However, the cost is prohibitive because the court would have to pay for both a mediator and an interpreter. In addition, the interpreter hourly rate is much higher than the rate of pay for a full-time bilingual family mediator. This resolution is not feasible because it more than doubles the cost of using a bilingual mediator.

The use of case- related family or friends to translate if a bilingual mediator is not available is not a viable option for the court because this action can create potential bias and unjustly compromise the case.

**5. Indicate the methodology used to determine the number of positions and amount of funding requested. (Use data from the Workload Analysis and Fiscal Detail, if applicable).**

In order to determine the number of positions required we used the following data, which was derived in part from the Workload Analysis can Case History Chart<sup>3</sup>:

- Based upon the workload analysis and the additional time required to process cases by a bilingual mediator, one bilingual mediator can process on average 280 cases annually<sup>4</sup>.
- The total cases requiring bilingual mediation for 2001 are

---

<sup>3</sup> See page 2 for more detail

<sup>4</sup> Between 1996 – 2001, the bilingual mediator processed a high of 300 cases annually to a low of 250 cases annually averaging 280 cases. See chart on page 2 for more detail.

$(360 \text{ ongoing cases}) + 480 \text{ (backlog of cases)} = 840 \text{ cases}$   
 $840 / 280 = 3 \text{ positions required to process all cases}$

- To process current cases the following permanent positions are needed  
 $360 / 280 = 1.3 \text{ positions}$
- To process the backlog the following one-year limited-term positions are needed  
 $480 / 280 = 1.7 \text{ positions}$
- The data indicates that 1.3 permanent bilingual mediators are necessary to process the current workload; however, the court is requesting only one permanent position and re-directing the .3 positions to limited term. The reason for this is because the court experienced a 30% growth in new cases between 2000-2001 and it is unclear if this tremendous growth in cases is going to be ongoing or if it was a one-time fluctuation. If subsequent yearly caseload data indicates that this increase in caseload is ongoing then the court will request the additional position during next year's budget request process.
- Therefore the following three positions are requested to process the bilingual mediation cases:

$1.7 + .3 = 2 \text{ one-year limited-term positions and}$   
 $1.3 - .3 = 1 \text{ permanent ongoing position}$

The two one-year limited-term positions will process the case backlog and the one permanent ongoing position will process the current caseload.

The amount of funding requested was determined by using the full-time salary paid to the existing bilingual family mediator. The standard complement for operating equipment and expenses was then added to the total salary and benefits.

**6. Thoroughly describe any additional items of expense. Provide an estimate of cost and the method used to determine the cost. (Use data from the Itemization List for Specified Items)**

Additional items for expense for equipment and service total \$4,850, which includes \$3,650 in one-time funding for equipment and \$1,200 in ongoing funding<sup>5</sup>. The one-time additional items of expense are for a laptop computer and cellular phone and the ongoing funding is for a cellular telephone service contract.

These additional items are needed for the one permanent bilingual mediator only. The permanent bilingual mediator will be conducting mediation sessions at

---

<sup>5</sup> See Itemization List for Specified Items for a complete description of these expenses;

various locations throughout the county. Therefore, the mediator will need to have access to his/her files and the main office when traveling to these remote locations.

To determine the cost for the laptop computer the court solicited three bids from three different vendors. The court selected the vendor with the most competitive price. A copy of the bid from ABC Computer was included with this request.

The court has an ongoing service agreement with Acme Cellular Phone Service. The court entered into this agreement in March of 2001 after a competitive bid process. Acme Cellular phone service provides the court with the quality of service and support that is necessary. Therefore, because there is an existing and recently established contract with this vendor, the court will continue to use this vendor for cellular phone service. A copy of the Acme Cellular Phone Service contract was included with this request.

**7. Describe how the request is consistent with local priorities and the court's strategic plan.**

This request is consistent with local priorities and the court's strategic plan. According to the court's strategic plan ensuring all citizens access to justice is a top priority. The goals identified in the strategic plan are as follows:

- Goal 1.2. – Increase access to court service for non-English speaking communities, strategies;
- Goal 1.2.1 – Improve provision of required interpreter services;
- Goal 1.2.2 – Assess adequacy of existing communication with non-English speaking communities and enhance where needed; and
- Goal 1.2.3 – Ensure the court's workforce is representative of the communities' bilingual and multicultural composition.

All of the goals mentioned above specifically address our need for a bilingual family mediator.

**D. Outcomes, Indicators and Performance Measures**

**Optimally, an outcome should be a bottom-line result of court systems activities such as Equal Access to Justice or Equality, Fairness and Integrity.**

**An indicator is a measure that helps to quantify the achievement of a desired outcome. Indicators help to answer the question, how would we know an outcome if we achieved it.**

**A performance measure is an activity that impacts an indicator, and ultimately relates to the achievement of the desired outcome. A performance measure is a**

**measure of how well programs are working. Typical performance measures address internal matters of timeliness, effectiveness, and compliance with standards.**

**1. What is the performance standard you would like to achieve in this service area? (e.g. notice of status review hearings mailed 30 days prior to each hearing, parent orientation provided in child custody mediation, etc.) Remember to include the current performance standard that is utilized in this service area.**

The performance standard we would like to achieve is as follows:  
*To conduct bilingual mediation sessions within 21 days of scheduling the appointment.*

The current performance standard:  
*Conducting bilingual mediation sessions within a minimum of 100 days of scheduling the appointment.*

**2. How will funding for the problem/need facilitate the courts ability to achieve this performance standard?**

The funding will enable the court to fund three positions, two one-year limited-term positions (to process the case backlog) and one permanent ongoing position (to process the current cases). By having the resources necessary to process bilingual mediation cases, the court will be able to reduce the delay in scheduling from 100 days to 21 days.

**3. If the requested funding is approved, how will you document improvements in service or access? Indicate the method of data collection that will be used and why this method is selected. (e.g., record examination, questionnaires, interviews, statistical analysis, structured observation, etc.)**

If the funding is approved the court will document improvements in service by collecting the following data:

- Record examination- The court will maintain statistical records and track 1) the number of cases referred to bilingual mediation, 2) the time that elapses between requesting this service and the actual mediation date, 3) case history in terms of progress through court offered services.
- Statistical Analysis- The court will aggregate this data and monitor case backlog.
- Questionnaires & Interviews- The court will interview clients in person or through a questionnaire to collect data regarding the quality of bilingual services offered.

These methods were selected because they will provide a comprehensive approach to track all relevant statistics.

## **E. Analysis of Feasible Alternatives**



**Provide a minimum of three feasible alternatives to address the problem/need. An analysis of the pros and cons, the dollar amount, the number of positions and any additional items of expense associated with each of the following alternatives should be included.**

I. Status Quo

Do not fund the request for three positions; two one-year limited-term positions to process the case backlog and one permanent ongoing position to process the current caseload.

Pro:

- By not funding the requested bilingual court mediator the general fund will not be impacted during this time of economic uncertainty.

Con:

- The court will continue to provide reduced services to monolingual Spanish speakers.
- Case backlog will continue to increase.
- The court will continue to be noncompliant with statutory mandates as existing resources make it impossible to provide mediation services to all segments of the population that require the service.

II. Fund the request for \$268,617 for three bilingual mediators, two positions to process the case backlog and one position to process the current caseload for a one-year limited-term. Included in this amount is \$185,995 for operating expenses and equipment and \$4,850 as an additional item of expense.

Pro:

- Limited-term funding will enable the court to hire the bilingual mediation staff necessary to provide mediation services and thereby eliminate case backlog.
- Limited-term funding for one-year will enable the court to track data regarding the use of full time bilingual mediation services which assist in providing the quantifiable data needed to further justify a BCR for ongoing funding in a subsequent year.

Con:

- Limited-term funding is only a temporary solution.
- Limited-term funding is may make it difficult to recruit a qualified bilingual mediator to the position
- At the conclusion of the two-year funding period the court will have to submit a request for ongoing funding and the court has no assurances that request for mediators will be a priority funding area.

III. Recommended Alternative

The recommended alternative is to augment the courts baseline budget by \$268,617 to fully fund three positions, two one-year limited-term positions to

process the case backlog and one permanent ongoing position to process the current caseload. Included in this amount is \$185,995 in one time funding and \$4,850 in additional items of expense.

Pro:

- Full funding will enable the court to provide equal access to mediation services for all segments of the population.
- Full funding will eliminate the courts backlog and ensure that requests for bilingual mediation are processed within the same timeframe as other requests for mediation.
- Expedite the Spanish-speaking families' progress through the court process.
- Increase public trust and confidence in the court system for all citizens especially those who are underserved.
- Assist in eliminating bias in the courts.

Con:

- Full funding will negatively impact the general fund during this time of economic uncertainty.
- Full funding will increase the state workforce on a permanent basis.

**WORKLOAD ANALYSIS WORKSHEET – NEW POSITIONS  
BUDGET CHANGE REQUESTS  
FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004**

|   |  |   |  |                             |                              |            |                |
|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|----------------|
| <b>Trial Court:</b>                                 |  | ABC Superior Court                        |  | <b>Request Number:</b>      |                              | 2          |                |
| <b>Contact Person:</b>                              |  | Preparer's Name                           |  | <b>Number of Positions:</b> |                              | 3          |                |
| <b>Telephone:</b>                                   |  | (415) 557-8000                            |  | Quantity                    | Per<br>Yr/Month/<br>Week/Day | Hrs.       | Annual<br>Hour |
| <b>Email Address:</b>                               |  | analyst@abc.superior.org                  |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| <b>BCR Title:</b>                                   |  | Bilingual Mediator                        |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| <b>Model Class No./Title</b>                        |  | 221a-Mediator                             |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| <b>Activity Name:</b>                               |  | Mediations- average caseload 280 annually |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| <b>Task Descriptions:</b> (list below)              |  |   |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| 1   | Conducts conferences, interviews, and orientations with bilingual parents and their attorneys to resolve custody/visitation evaluations and disputes |   |  | 1,120                       | year                         | 3.0        | 3,360          |
| 2   | Develops custody and visitation agreement, which are made into enforceable orders of court   |   |  | 40                          | month                        | 1.5        | 720            |
| 3   | Provides follow-up conferences with parents and ongoing case management  |   |  | 20                          | week                         | .5         | 520            |
| 4   |  |   |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| <b>Total Annual Hours</b>                           |  |   |  |                             |                              |            | <b>4,600</b>   |
|   |  |   |  |                             |                              |            | <b>65%</b>     |
| <b>Activity Name:</b>                               |  | Assessments and Evaluations               |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| <b>Task Descriptions:</b> (list below)              |  |   |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| 1   | Conducts research, investigations, and interviews with other parties (e.g. extend family, therapists, children, etc.)                                |   |  | 20                          | week                         | .5         | 520            |
| 2   | Writes recommendations and interview summaries   |   |  | 1,120                       | year                         | .7         | 784            |
| 3   | Prepares case histories and keeps records of subsequent contacts with clients  |   |  | 1,120                       | year                         | .3         | 336            |
| 4   |  |   |  |                             |                              |            | 0              |
| <b>Total Annual Hours</b>                           |  |   |  |                             |                              |            | <b>1,640</b>   |
|   |  |   |  |                             |                              |            | <b>23%</b>     |
| <b>Activity Name:</b>                               |  | Court Appearances                         |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| <b>Task Descriptions:</b> (list below)              |  |   |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| 1   | Attends court hearings   |   |  | 4                           | week                         | 1.0        | 208            |
| 2   |  |   |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| 3   |  |   |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| 4   |  |   |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| <b>Total Annual Hours</b>                           |  |   |  |                             |                              |            | <b>208</b>     |
|   |  |   |  |                             |                              |            | <b>3%</b>      |
| <b>Activity Name:</b>                               |  | Administrative Functions                  |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| <b>Task Descriptions:</b> (list below)              |  |   |  |                             |                              |            |                |
| 1   | Review client mediation and orientation evaluation forms   |   |  | 4                           | Day                          | 0.25       | 260            |
| 2   | Consult and review cases with Family Court Services Director   |   |  | 4                           | month                        | 4.0        | 192            |
| 3   | Participate in peer consultation, case conferencing, and update orientation forms and materials  |   |  | 8                           | year                         | 8.0        | 64             |
| 4   | Participate in continuing education and other professional development trainings   |   |  | 4                           | month                        | 1.0        | 48             |
| 5   | Develops miscellaneous memorandums and correspondence  |   |  | 4                           | week                         | 0.5        | 104            |
| <b>Total Annual Hours</b>                           |  |   |  |                             |                              |            | <b>668</b>     |
|   |  |   |  |                             |                              |            | <b>9%</b>      |
| <b>Grand Total Annual Hours: *</b>                  |  |   |  |                             |                              |            | <b>7,116</b>   |
|   |  |   |  |                             |                              |            | <b>100%</b>    |
| <b>Full Time Equivalents Required to Complete:</b>  |  |   |  |                             |                              | <b>4.0</b> |                |
| <b>Currently Authorized Positions:</b>              |  |   |  |                             |                              | <b>1.0</b> |                |
| <b>Additional FTE's Requested in this Proposal:</b> |  |   |  |                             |                              | <b>3.0</b> |                |

\*Note: One FTE = 1,778 hours – Percentage must equal 100% for FTE.

**BUDGET CHANGE REQUEST PACKAGE  
FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004  
Fiscal Detail Worksheet**

| Ct. Code:   |   | ▼                  | Sample              | BCR request #:                    | 2a                        |                            | ▼                         |
|---|---|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Contact Person:   |   |                    |                     | Nature of Request:                |                           |                            |                           |
| Telephone Number:   |   |                    |                     | Duration of Limited Months:       |                           |                            |                           |
| Email Address:  |   |                    |                     | PECT drop down menu               |                           |                            |                           |
| PECT Description:   | Family and Children   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            |                           |
| BCR Title:  | Bilingual Mediator  |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            |                           |
| <b>I. SUMMARY OF PERSONAL SERVICES</b>                        |   |                    |                     | <b>Enter Whole Dollars (ONLY)</b> |                           |                            |                           |
| Sal Ben<br>Line   | Classification Title  | Model Class<br>No. | No. of<br>Positions | MONTHLY SALARY RANGE              |                           |                            | Total Salary              |
|   |   |                    |                     | Minimum                           | Middle                    | Maximum                    |                           |
| a   | Mediator/Counselor  | 221a               | 1.0                 | 4,421                             | 4,874                     | 5,374                      | 58,488                    |
| b   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | -                         |
| c   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | -                         |
| d   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | -                         |
| e   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | -                         |
| f   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | -                         |
| g   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | -                         |
| <b>Total Positions/Salaries</b>                               |   |                    | <b>1.0</b>          |                                   |                           |                            | <b>58,488</b>             |
| Salary Savings (5%)   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | (2,924)                   |
| <b>Net Salary &amp; Wages</b>                                 |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | <b>55,564</b>             |
| Staff Benefits:   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            |                           |
|   | Salary Driven Benefits (From Benefit and Pay Parity Worksheets) |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | 13,480                    |
|   | Non-Salary Driven Benefits (From Benefit Worksheet)             |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | 5,879                     |
|   | <b>Total Staff Benefits</b>                                     |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | <b>19,359</b>             |
| Temporary Help (enter actual amount needed)                   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | -                         |
| Overtime (enter actual amount needed)                         |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | -                         |
| <b>Total Personal Services</b>                                |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | <b>74,922</b>             |
| <b>II. SUMMARY OF OPERATING EXPENSES &amp; EQUIPMENT</b>      |   |                    |                     | <b>Enter Whole Dollars (ONLY)</b> |                           |                            |                           |
| <b>Bold &amp; italicized objects require Itemization list</b> |   |                    |                     | <b>Additional Items</b>           |                           | <b>Standard Complement</b> |                           |
| <b>Object of Expenditure</b>                                  |   |                    |                     | <b>One-Time<br/>Amount</b>        | <b>Ongoing<br/>Amount</b> | <b>One-Time<br/>Amount</b> | <b>Ongoing<br/>Amount</b> |
| <b>Minor Equipment (under \$5,000 per item)</b>               |   |                    |                     | 3,650                             |                           |                            | 500                       |
| <b>Minor EDP Equipment (under \$5,000 per item)</b>           |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           | 2,000                      | 500                       |
| Other General Expense   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | 1,500                     |
| Printing  |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | 500                       |
| Communications  |   |                    |                     |                                   | 1,200                     |                            | 1,000                     |
| Postage   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | 500                       |
| Travel  |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | 500                       |
| Training  |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | 500                       |
| Facilities Operations   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           | 4,500                      |                           |
| Utilities   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            |                           |
| <b>Consulting and Professional (contracts)</b>                |   |                    |                     | -                                 | -                         |                            |                           |
| Data Processing   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            | 1,000                     |
| <b>Major Equipment (over \$5,000 per item)</b>                |   |                    |                     | -                                 | -                         |                            | -                         |
| <b>Total Operating Expenses &amp; Equipment</b>               |   |                    |                     | 3,650                             | 1,200                     | 6,500                      | 6,500                     |
| <b>Special Items of Expense (See Instructions)</b>            |   |                    |                     | -                                 | -                         |                            |                           |
| <b>Total Budget Request</b>                                   |   |                    |                     | 3,650                             | 1,200                     | 6,500                      | 6,500                     |
| <b>Offsets (enter as a negative amount)</b>                   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            |                           |
| <b>Net Budget Request</b>                                     |   |                    |                     | <b>3,650</b>                      | <b>1,200</b>              | <b>6,500</b>               | <b>6,500</b>              |
| <b>AOC use ONLY:</b>  |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            |                           |
| Total One-time:   | 10,150  |                    | Total Ongoing       | 82,622                            |                           | Total Offsets:             |                           |
|   |   |                    |                     |                                   |                           |                            |                           |
| Local needs   |   | Drop down menu     |                     |                                   |                           |                            |                           |

**Superior Court of CA, County of Siskiyou**  
**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROJECT:**  
**TRENDS IMPLICATIONS SUMMARY**  
July 1, 2002

**Trend:**

| On the Substance of the Law | On Demands Placed on the Courts   | On Court Infrastructure   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
|                             | <u>Quantitative Implications:</u> | <u>Hard Infrastructure:</u> (Technology, Facilities and Equipment)  |
|                             | <u>Qualitative Implications:</u>  | <u>Soft Infrastructure:</u> (Policy-Formation, Planning, Budgeting, Staffing and Training, Management, Communications and Coordination, and Performance Monitoring) |

**Superior Court of CA, County of Siskiyou**  
**PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROJECT**

**CRIMINAL CASE DATA SUMMARY**

July 1, 2002

| <u>Criminal Caseload Overview</u> | <u>2002</u> | <u>2003</u> | <u>% Change</u> |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|

1. # Case Filings

- a. Felonies
- b. Misdemeanors

2. # Case Dispositions

- a. Felonies
- b. Misdemeanors

3. Types of Dispositions

a. Felonies

- A
- B
- C

b. Misdemeanors

- A
- B
- C

4. Ave. # Hearings Per Case

- a. Felonies
- b. Misdemeanors

5. % Cases Referred to Probation Services

6. % Cases Referred to Home Incarceration

7. % Cases Processed Within ABA Standard of:

- a. 90 Days

- b. 120 Days
- c. 180 Days

#### Offender Compliance

##### 8. % of Offenders Who Complete Conditions of Sentence

- a. Felonies
- b. Misdemeanors

##### 8. % of Offenders Who Appear in Court For an Additional Violation Within:

- a. Misdemeanors 1 Year
- b. Felonies 5 Years

#### Justice System Personnel Assessment

[focus group and/or agency partner survey findings]

#### Infrastructure Assessment Summary

## Infrastructure Assessment

Determining the presence or absence of the infrastructure needed to support work processes and programs, is a key feature of the Siskiyou County Superior Court performance measurement system. In particular, performance measurement mapping has revealed that the success of work processes and programs is often very dependent on supporting infrastructure. As a result many of the performance measures used by the performance measurement system focus on aspects of infrastructure. In addition, infrastructure, unlike the desired outcomes of a lot of court activity -- such as crime rates -- often are more within the control or influence of Superior Court policy and activity.

The purpose of the infrastructure inventory checklist is to provide a qualitative assessment of whether needed infrastructure is present or absent.

### 1. Policy-Making

#### (a) Adequacy of Policy-Making

- Capacity to inventory assessment and treatment providers (e.g. DUI courses).  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Determining and continuously updating the range and scope of services to be provided as part of criminal case processing, such as preparing pre-sentence reports.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Determining the implications of changes in criminal law for Court policies and procedures.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Working with DAs to determine charge policies and timely case processing procedures.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Policies for establishing pleas-cut off procedures and alternative sanctions, and for maintaining consistent practices among judges.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

#### (b) Comments of Policy-Making adequacy.



## 2. Planning

### (a) Adequacy of Planning

- Court-wide strategic, long-range, and operational planning to integrate criminal case processing with the work of the Court in general.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Operational planning with probation and service provision agencies to establish service standards.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Long-range planning to forecast caseloads.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Interagency operational planning with law enforcement and victims assistance agencies.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Space and facilities planning.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Strategic and long-range planning to anticipate implications of changes in legislation, such as the passage of Proposition 36.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Project planning to establish evaluation procedures.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

### (b) Comments on Planning adequacy

## 3. Finance and Budgeting

### (a) Types of Finance and Budgeting Needed

- Sufficient and predictable resources needed to meet the goals of criminal case processing, including the resources needed to affect long-term cultural change.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

- A capacity to obtain funds from sources other than the state and county governments, such as from federal government grants.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- A capacity to increase resources and modify expenditures within an annual budget cycle, in light of changes in demand for services.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- A capacity to use resources from throughout the entire Court when needed.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments of Finance and Budget Adequacy

#### 4. Staffing and Training

(a) Adequacy of Staffing and Training

- Judge and staff training needed to effectively process criminal cases, such as case management training.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Cultural diversity training.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Interview skills and customer service training, including training on how to deal with court users under stress.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to provide a level of service coverage that meets public expectations.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments of Staffing and Training Adequacy

## 5. Management

### (a) Adequacy of Management

- Commitment by judges, administrators, and staff to use standardized case processing procedures in all Court divisions. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to provide adequate supervision and guidance to the diverse types of Court personnel, including judges. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity of the Court administration to insure proper oversight of criminal case processing in general. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to instill confidence in Court leadership among all judges and personnel, and a willingness among all personnel to follow the direction of leaders. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

### (c) Comments on Management Adequacy

## 6. Communications and Coordination

### (a) Adequacy of Communication/Coordination

- Capacity for those responsible for criminal case processing to communicate with personnel from throughout the Court, service providers, and other justice partners. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity for those responsible for criminal case processing to communicate with citizen groups, volunteers, individual citizens, and the public at large. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- (b) Comments on Communications/Coordination Adequacy

## 7. Technology

### (a) Adequacy of Technology Needed to Support Criminal Case Processing

- A variety of different types of communications technology for linking Court personnel with different units, state and local databases, and other justice agencies, including the DMV. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records technology for linking cases across court divisions and units, e.g. linking juvenile, dependency, criminal, and other cases involving a single family. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records production and management technology. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Office technology, e.g. word processing, presentation software. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Computer workstations. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Case scheduling, tracking, and calendaring programs. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Jail inventory and prisoner tracking systems. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

### (b) Comments on Technology Adequacy

## 8. Equipment

### (a) Adequacy of Equipment

- Photocopiers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Evidence and presentation equipment ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Furniture ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Telecommunications, FAX, printers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

- Word processing equipment ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Data base access terminals ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Equipment Adequacy

## 9. Facilities

(a) Adequacy of Facilities Needed to Support Criminal Case Processing

- Common and private work and meeting spaces ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Public information dissemination areas ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Evidence storage areas ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Courtrooms, hearings rooms and judges chambers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records rooms and storage spaces ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Secure holding areas ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Facilities adequacy

**Superior Court of CA, County of Siskiyou**  
**PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROJECT**

**CIVIL CASE DATA SUMMARY**

July 1, 2002

| <u>Civil Caseload Overview</u> | <u>2002</u> | <u>2003</u> | <u>% Change</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|

1. # Case Filings

- a. Small Claims Court
  - (1) Individuals
  - (2) Multiple Filers
- b. Limited Civil
- c. General Civil

2. # Case Dispositions

- a. Small Claims Court
  - (1) Individuals
  - (2) Multiple Filers
- b. Limited Civil
- c. General Civil

3. Types of Dispositions

- a. Small Claims Cases
  - A
  - B
  - C
- b. Limited Civil
  - A
  - B
  - C
- c. General Civil
  - A
  - B
  - C

#### 4. Ave. # Hearings Per Case

- a. Limited Civil
- b. General Civil

#### 6. Types of Hearings

- a. Limited Civil

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)

- b. General Civil

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)

#### 5. Cases Completed Within ABA Standard of:

- a. Limited Civil

- 1 year
- 18 months
- more than 18 months

- b. General Civil

- 1 year
- 18 months
- more than 18 months

#### User Assessment

[focus group findings]

## Justice System Personnel Assessment

[focus group findings]



## Infrastructure Assessment

Determining the presence or absence of the infrastructure needed to support work processes and programs, is a key feature of the Siskiyou County Superior Court performance measurement system. In particular, performance measurement mapping has revealed that the success of work processes and programs is often very dependent on supporting infrastructure. As a result many of the performance measures used by the performance measurement system focus on aspects of infrastructure. In addition, infrastructure, unlike the desired outcomes of a lot of court activity -- such as crime rates -- often are more within the control or influence of Superior Court policy and activity.

The purpose of the infrastructure inventory checklist is to provide a qualitative assessment of whether needed infrastructure is present or absent.

### 1. Policy-Making

#### (a) Policy-Making Adequacy

- Capacity to work with county clerk and recorder to establish document management procedures. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to work with Sheriff's civil office to serve and enforce judgments. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Determining and continuously updating the range and scope of services to be provided as part of civil case processing, such as pro se services. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Determining policies regarding providing information and legal advice. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Determining the implications of changes in civil case law (e.g., changes in Small Claims limit) for Court policies and procedures. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Policies for establishing procedures for maintaining consistent practices among court staff and judges. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

#### (b) Comments on Policy-Making Adequacy

## 2. Planning

### (a) Planning Adequacy

- Court-wide strategic, long-range, and operational planning to integrate civil case processing with the work of the Court in general.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Long-range planning to forecast caseloads and changes in service demand.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Space and facilities planning.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Strategic and long-range planning to anticipate implications of changes in legislation.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Project planning to establish evaluation procedures.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate

### (b) Comments on Planning Adequacy

## 3. Finance and Budgeting

### (a) Finance and Budgeting Adequacy

- A capacity to split revenues between local and state funds, and by processing tracks.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- A capacity to assign different case costs for three different case processing tracks.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- A capacity to use resources from throughout the entire Court when needed.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate

### (c) Comments on Finance and Budgeting Adequacy

#### 4. Staffing and Training

(a) Staffing and Training Adequacy

- Judge and staff training needed to effectively process civil cases, such as case procedure training at all court sites, training about unlawful detainer case processing procedures, and how to provide pro se assistance.  
☐ Adequate ☒ Inadequate
- Cultural diversity training.  
☐ Adequate ☒ Inadequate
- Interview skills and customer service training, including training on how to deal with court users under stress.  
☐ Adequate ☒ Inadequate
- Capacity to provide full service coverage that meets public expectations.  
☐ Adequate ☒ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Staffing and Training Adequacy

## 5. Management

(a) Management Adequacy

- Commitment by judges, administrators, and staff to use standardized case processing procedures in all Court divisions. ☐ Adequate ☒ Inadequate
- Commitment by the Court in general to the importance of civil case processing. ☐ Adequate ☒ Inadequate
- Capacity to assign cases to appropriate case processing tracks. ☐ Adequate ☒ Inadequate
- Capacity to provide adequate supervision and guidance to the diverse types of Court personnel, including judges. ☐ Adequate ☒ Inadequate
- Capacity of the Court administration to insure proper oversight of civil case processing in general. ☐ Adequate ☒ Inadequate

- Capacity to instill confidence in Court leadership among all judges and personnel, and a willingness among all personnel to follow the direction of leaders. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Management Adequacy

## 6. Communications and Coordination

(a) Adequacy of Communication and Coordination Needed

- Capacity to answer detailed questions about case processing including phone requests for information. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to interact with other agencies, including the Sheriff's civil office, the recorder, and small claims facilitators. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity for those responsible for civil case processing to communicate with personnel from throughout the Court, service providers, and other justice partners, including Court personnel located in remote part of Siskiyou County. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity for those responsible for civil case processing to communicate with citizen groups, volunteers, individual citizens, and the public at large. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Communications Adequacy

## 7. Technology

### (a) Technology Adequacy

- A variety of different types of communications technology for linking Court personnel with different units, state and local databases.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Records technology for linking case information among agencies.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Records production and management technology, including the capacity to handle very large case files (e.g. imaging technology).  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Video teleconferencing.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Office technology, e.g. word processing, presentation software.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Computer workstations.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity for case filing at Court locations across the County.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Case scheduling, tracking, and calendaring programs, especially systems for scheduling attorney activities.  
☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Records technology for recording fees payments. ☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate
- Access to JALAN ☐ Adequate   ☐ Inadequate

### (b) Comments on Technology Adequacy

## 8. Equipment

### (a) Adequacy of Equipment Needed to Support Civil Case Processing

- Photocopiers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Public access terminals at sites across the County ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Notice software and mailing equipment ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Furniture ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Telecommunications, FAX, printers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Word processing equipment ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Data base access terminals ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- (b) Comments on Equipment Adequacy

## 9. Facilities

### (a) Facilities Adequacy

- Common and private work and meeting spaces ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Public information dissemination areas ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Public meeting spaces to review records ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records storage areas ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Courtrooms, hearings rooms, and judges chambers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

- Records rooms and storage space ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Adequate counter-space at all court sites ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments of Facilities Adequacy

**Superior Court of CA, County of Siskiyou**  
**PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROJECT**

**TRAFFIC CASE DATA SUMMARY**

July 1, 2002

| <u>Traffic Caseload Overview</u> | <u>2002</u> | <u>2003</u> | <u>% Change</u> |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|

1. # Case Filings

- a. Commercial vehicle
- b. DUI
- c. Moving Violations

2. # Case Dispositions

- a. Commercial vehicle
- b. DUI
- c. Moving Violations

3. Types of Dispositions

a. Commercial Vehicle

- A
- B
- C

b. DUI

- A
- B
- C

c. Moving Violations

- A
- B
- C

4. % Cases That Required Hearings

- a. Commercial Vehicle
- b. DUI
- c. Moving Violations



5. % Cases Referred to Probation Services

- a. DUI
- b. Moving Violations

6. Ave. Days Case Processing Time

- a. Parking
- b. Other Infractions
- c. Moving Violations

Offender Compliance

8. % of Offenders Who Appear in  
Court For an Additional Moving  
Violation Within 1 Year

Offender Assessment

[focus group findings]

Justice System Personnel Assessment

[focus group findings]

## Infrastructure Assessment

Determining the presence or absence of the infrastructure needed to support work processes and programs, is a key feature of the Siskiyou County Superior Court performance measurement system. In particular, performance measurement mapping has revealed that the success of work processes and programs is often very dependent on supporting infrastructure. As a result many of the performance measures used by the performance measurement system focus on aspects of infrastructure. In addition, infrastructure, unlike the desired outcomes of a lot of court activity -- such as crime rates -- often are more within the control or influence of Superior Court policy and activity.

The purpose of the infrastructure inventory checklist is to provide a qualitative assessment of whether needed infrastructure is present or absent.

### 1. Policy-Making

#### (a) Adequacy of Policy-Making Needed

- Capacity to inventory assessment and treatment providers (e.g. traffic school). ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Determining and continuously updating the range and scope of services to be provided as part of traffic case processing. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Determining the implications of changes in traffic offense law for Court policies and procedures. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Policies for establishing procedures with the DMV, alternative sanctions, and for maintaining consistent practices among judges. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Bail policies. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Policies for ticket collection. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

#### (b) Comments on Policy-Making Adequacy

## 2. Planning

### (a) Adequacy of Planning Needed

- Court-wide strategic, long-range, and operational planning to integrate traffic case processing with the work of the Court in general.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Operational planning with probation and service provision agencies to establish service standards.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Long-range planning to forecast caseloads.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Interagency operational planning with law enforcement, especially the California Highway Patrol, and the Department of Motor Vehicles.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Space and facilities planning.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Strategic and long-range planning to anticipate implications of changes in legislation.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Project planning to establish evaluation procedures.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

### (b) Comments on Planning Adequacy

## 3. Finance and Budgeting

### (a) Adequacy of Finance and Budgeting

- A capacity to split revenues between local and state funds.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- A capacity to use resources from throughout the entire Court when needed.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Finance and Budgeting Adequacy

4. Staffing and Training

(a) Adequacy of Staffing and Training Needed

- Judge and staff training needed to effectively process traffic cases, such as case procedure training at all court sites. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Training about use of discretion in traffic case processing. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Cultural diversity training. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Interview skills and customer service training, including training on how to deal with court users under stress. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to provide full service coverage that meets public expectations. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Staffing and Training Adequacy

- Does the Court have the trained personnel needed to meet public expectations for effective traffic case processing? ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Can the Court access staff at all locations to process traffic cases? ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

5. Management

(a) Adequacy of Management

- Commitment by judges, administrators, and staff to use standardized case processing procedures in all Court divisions. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to provide adequate supervision and guidance to the diverse types of Court personnel, including judges. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

- Capacity of the Court administration to insure proper oversight of traffic case processing in general. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to instill confidence in Court leadership among all judges and personnel, and a willingness among all personnel to follow the direction of leaders. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Management Adequacy

## 6. Communications and Coordination

(a) Adequacy Communication and Coordination Needed

- Capacity to answer detailed questions about case processing including phone requests for information. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to interact with other agencies, especially the Department of Motor Vehicles. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity for those responsible for traffic case processing to communicate with personnel from throughout the Court, service providers, and other justice partners. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity for those responsible for traffic case processing to communicate with citizen groups, volunteers, individual citizens, and the public at large, including trucking companies and trucking interest groups. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to clarify the consequences for non-compliance. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Communications Adequacy

## 7. Technology

### (a) Adequacy of Technology Needed to Support Traffic Case Processing

- A variety of different types of communications technology for linking Court personnel with different units, state and local data bases, and other justice agencies, especially the Department of Motor Vehicles.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records technology for linking case information among agencies.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records production and management technology, including procedures for working with error codes.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Office technology, e.g. word processing, presentation software.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Computer workstations.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Case scheduling, tracking, and calendaring programs.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records technology for recording fines and fees payments.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

### (b) Comments on Technology Adequacy

## 8. Equipment

### (a) Adequacy of Equipment Needed to Support Traffic Case Processing

- Photocopiers  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Notice software and mailing equipment  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

- Furniture ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Telecommunications, FAX, printers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Word processing equipment ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Data base access terminals ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Equipment Adequacy

## 9. Facilities

(a) Adequacy of Facilities

- Common and private work and meeting spaces ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Public information dissemination areas ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records storage areas ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Courtrooms, hearings rooms, and judges chambers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records rooms and storage space ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Adequate counter-space at all court sites ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Facilities Adequacy

**Superior Court of CA, County of Siskiyou**  
**PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROJECT**  
**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASE DATA SUMMARY**  
July 1, 2002

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASES**

| <u>Domestic Violence Caseload Overview</u> | <u>2002</u> | <u>2003</u> | <u>% Change</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------|

1. # Case Filings

- a. Criminal Cases
- b. Restraining Orders

2. # Case Dispositions

- a. Criminal Cases
- b. Protection Orders

3. Types of Dispositions

- a. Criminal Cases
  - A
  - B
  - C

4. Ave. # Hearings

- a. Criminal Case
- b. Protection Orders

5. % Cases Referred to Probation Services

- a. Criminal Case Probation
- b. Summary Probation

6. % Cases Processed Within ABA Standard of:

- a. Criminal Cases
  - 90 Days
  - 120 Days
  - 180 Days



b. Protection Orders

- 1 day
- 3 days
- 21 days
- More than 21 days

Offender Compliance

7. % of Offenders Who Complete  
Conditions of Sentence

8. % of Offenders Who Appear in  
Court For an Additional DV  
Violation Within 1 Year

Victim Assessment

[This section will be a summary of focus group findings.]

Offender Assessment

[focus group findings]

Justice System Personnel Assessment

[focus group findings]

Infrastructure Summary

## Infrastructure Assessment

Determining the presence or absence of the infrastructure needed to support work processes and programs, is a key feature of the Siskiyou County Superior Court performance measurement system. In particular, performance measurement mapping has revealed that the success of work processes and programs is often very dependent on supporting infrastructure. As a result many of the performance measures used by the performance measurement system focus on aspects of infrastructure. In addition, infrastructure, unlike the desired outcomes of a lot of court activity -- such as crime rates -- often are more within the control or influence of Superior Court policy and activity.

The purpose of the infrastructure inventory checklist is to provide a qualitative assessment of whether needed infrastructure is present or absent.

### 1. Policy-Making

#### (a) Adequacy of Policy-Making

- Capacity to inventory appropriate treatment providers. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Determining and continuously updating the range and scope of services to be provided as part of DV case processing. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Establish cross-agency policies and procedures with partner agencies such as Child Protective Services. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Determining the implications of changes in DV law for Court policies and procedures. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Generating the long-term financial support for establishing and maintaining the infrastructure needed to sustain DV case processing, including policies about the hours services will be provided. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Policies for establishing and maintaining consistent practices among judges and court personnel. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

#### (b) Comments on Policy-Making Adequacy

## 2. Planning

### (a) Adequacy of Planning

- Court-wide strategic, long-range, and operational planning to integrate DV case processing with the work of the Court in general.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Operational planning with service provision agencies to establish service standards.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Interagency operational planning with law enforcement and victims assistance agencies.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Space and facilities planning.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Strategic and long-range planning to anticipate implications of changes in legislation.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Project planning to establish evaluation procedures.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Technology planning to identify risk assessment instruments and tools for electronic information exchange and case tracking.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Case management planning.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

### (b) Comments on Planning adequacy

## 3. Finance and Budgeting

### (a) Types of Finance and Budgeting Needed

- Capacity to work effectively with the Court finance unit for treatment provider and court fee collection.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

- Flexibility to adjust fee schedules for lower income clients.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Sufficient and predictable resources needed to meet the goals of DV case processing, including the resources needed to affect long-term cultural change.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- A capacity to obtain funds from sources other than the state and county governments, such as from federal government grants.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- A capacity to increase resources and modify expenditures within an annual budget cycle, in light of changes in consumer driven demand for services.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- A capacity to use resources from throughout the entire Court when needed.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Budget and Finance adequacy

#### 4. Staffing and Training

(a) Adequacy of Staffing and Training

- Judge and staff training needed to effectively process DV cases.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Cultural diversity training.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Interview skills and customer service training, including training on how to deal with court users under stress.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to provide a level of service coverage that meets public expectations.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Staff to monitor case progress.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

- Training about effects of DV on families and children.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Training about forms of violence. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Training needed to detect and test for substance and alcohol use.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Staffing and Training adequacy

## 5. Management

### (a) Adequacy of Management

- Commitment by judges, administrators, and staff to use standardized DV case processing procedures. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to provide adequate supervision and guidance to the diverse types of Court personnel. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to supervise case management. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity of the Court administrative chain of command to insure proper oversight of DV case processing in general. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to oversee distribution of workload among probation workers.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to instill confidence in Court leadership among all judges and personnel, and a willingness among all personnel to follow the direction of leaders. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Management Adequacy

6. Communications/Coordination

(a) Adequacy of Communication/Coordination

- Capacity for those responsible for DV case processing to communicate with personnel from throughout the Court, service providers, and other justice partners. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Consistency in court orders across divisions. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to provide consistent message to a family from all service providers. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to link treatment and financial plans. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity for those responsible for DV case processing to communicate with citizen groups, volunteers, individual citizens, and the public at large. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Need for standard reporting procedures from treatment providers. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to communicate case information among Court units. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Communications Adequacy.

## 7. Technology

### (a) Technology Adequacy

- A variety of different types of communications technology for linking Court personnel with different units, state and local databases, and other justice agencies, such as police agencies and child protection services.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records production and management technology. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Office technology, e.g. word processing, presentation software.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Computer workstations. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Case scheduling, tracking, and calendaring programs.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Access to fee and fines tracking software. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Message software, including triage software. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

### (b) Comments of Technology Adequacy.

## 8. Equipment

### (a) Equipment Adequacy

- Photocopiers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Furniture ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Telecommunications, FAX, printers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Word processing equipment ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

- Data base access terminals ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- JALAN, and jail management system access ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(c) Comments on Equipment Adequacy.

## 9. Facilities

(a) Adequacy of Facilities Needed to Support DV Case Processing

- Common and private work and meeting spaces ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Public information dissemination areas ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Courtrooms, hearings rooms, and judges chambers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records rooms and storage spaces ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Waiting room and child care space ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Facilities Adequacy.



**Superior Court of CA, County of Siskiyou**  
**PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROJECT**

**DRUG CASE DATA SUMMARY**

July 1, 2002

| <u>Drug Offense Caseload Overview</u> | <u>2002</u> | <u>2003</u> | <u>% Change</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|

1. # Case Filings

- a. Adult Drug Cases
- b. Adult Drug Court Cases
- c. Juvenile Drug Cases
- d. Juvenile Drug Court Cases
- e. Proposition 36 Cases

2. # Case Dispositions

- a. Adult Drug Cases
- b. Adult Drug Court Cases
- c. Juvenile Drug Cases
- d. Juvenile Drug Court Cases
- e. Proposition 36 Cases

3. Types of Dispositions

a. Adult Drug Cases

- A
- B
- C

b. Adult Drug Court

- A
- B
- C

c. Juvenile Drug Cases

- A
- B
- C

d. Juvenile Drug Court

- A
- B
- C

e. Proposition 36 Cases

- A
- B
- C

- A
- B
- C

4. Ave. # Hearings Per Case

- a. Adult Drug Cases
- b. Adult Drug Court Cases
- c. Juvenile Drug Cases
- d. Juvenile Drug Court Cases
- e. Proposition 36 Cases

5. % Cases Referred to Probation Services

6. % Cases Processed Within ABA Standard of:

a. Adult Drug Cases

- 90
- 120
- 180

b. Adult Drug Court Cases

- 90
- 120
- 180

c. Juvenile Drug Cases

- 90

- 120
- 180

d. Juvenile Drug Court Cases

- 90
- 120
- 180

e. Proposition 36 Cases

- 90
- 120
- 180

Offender Compliance

7. % of Offenders Who Complete Conditions of Sentence

- a. Adult Drug Cases
- b. Adult Drug Court Cases
- c. Juvenile Drug Cases
- d. Juvenile Drug Court Cases
- e. Proposition 36 Cases

8. % of Offenders Who Appear in Court For an Additional Violation Within 1 Year

- a. Adult Drug Cases
- b. Adult Drug Court Cases
- c. Juvenile Drug Cases
- d. Juvenile Drug Court Cases
- e. Proposition 36 Court Cases

Offender Assessment

[focus group findings]

## Justice System Personnel Assessment

[focus group findings]

## Infrastructure Assessment

Determining the presence or absence of the infrastructure needed to support work processes and programs, is a key feature of the Siskiyou County Superior Court performance measurement system. In particular, performance measurement mapping has revealed that the success of work processes and programs is often very dependent on supporting infrastructure. As a result many of the performance measures used by the performance measurement system focus on aspects of infrastructure. In addition, infrastructure, unlike the desired outcomes of a lot of court activity -- such as crime rates -- often are more within the control or influence of Superior Court policy and activity.

The purpose of the infrastructure inventory checklist is to provide a qualitative assessment of whether needed infrastructure is present or absent.

### 1. Policy-Making

#### (a) Adequacy of Policy-Making

- Capacity to identify target populations and establish eligibility requirements.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to inventory appropriate treatment providers.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Determining and continuously updating the range and scope of services to be provided as part of drug case processing.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Determining the implications of changes in drug law for Court policies and procedures, such as the passage of Proposition 36.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Generating the long-term financial support for establishing and maintaining the infrastructure needed to sustain drug case processing.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Policies for establishing and maintaining consistent practices among judges and court personnel.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Policies for clarifying the roles and responsibilities of agency partners.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

#### (b) Comments on Policy-Making Adequacy

## 2. Planning

### (a) Adequacy of Planning

- Court-wide strategic, long-range, and operational planning to integrate drug court case processing with the work of the Court in general.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Operational planning with service provision agencies to establish service standards.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Interagency operational planning with law enforcement and service agencies.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Space and facilities planning.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Strategic and long-range planning to anticipate implications of changes in legislation.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Project planning to establish evaluation procedures.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Technology planning to identify risk assessment instruments and tools for electronic information exchange and case tracking.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

### (b) Comments on Planning Adequacy

## 3. Finance and Budgeting

### (a) Adequacy of Finance and Budgeting

- Capacity to work effectively with the Court finance unit for fee collection in cases involving adult offenders.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

- Sufficient and predictable resources needed to meet the goals of drug case processing, including the resources needed to affect long-term cultural change. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- A capacity to obtain funds from sources other than the state and county governments, such as from federal government grants. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- A capacity to increase resources and modify expenditures within an annual budget cycle, in light of changes in consumer driven demand for services. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- A capacity to contract for support services, including the transportation of offenders from remote locations across the County. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- A capacity to use resources from throughout the entire Court when needed. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Finance and Budgeting Adequacy

#### 4. Staffing and Training

(a) Adequacy of Staffing and Training

- Judge and staff training needed to effectively process drug cases. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Cultural diversity training to better serve the needs of diverse groups of people within Siskiyou County. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Interview skills and customer service training, including training on how to deal with court users under stress. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to provide a level of service coverage that meets public expectations. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

- Staff to prepare procedures manuals and participant handbooks.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Training needed to use risk assessment tools. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Training needed to detect and test for substance use.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Staffing Adequacy

## 5. Management

(a) Adequacy of Management Needed

- Commitment by judges, administrators, and staff to use standardized drug court case processing procedures. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to provide adequate supervision and guidance to the diverse types of Court personnel. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity of the Court administrative chain of command to insure proper oversight of drug court case processing in general.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to manage individual cases. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to oversee distribution of workload among probation workers.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to instill confidence in Court leadership among all judges and personnel, and a willingness among all personnel to follow the direction of leaders.  
☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate



(c) Comments on Management Adequacy

- Do the personnel assigned to drug court case processing receive the supervision and guidance they need? ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Does the Court administrative and governance structure assure that judges, court managers and personnel are aware of, and able to support drug case processing? ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

6. Communications and Coordination

(a) Adequacy of Communication and Coordination Needed

- Capacity to facilitate agreement about drug court philosophy among justice system personnel. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity for those responsible for drug case processing to communicate with personnel from throughout the Court, service providers, and other justice partners. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity for those responsible for drug case processing to communicate with citizen groups, volunteers, individual citizens, and the public at large. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Need for standard reporting procedures from treatment providers. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to protect confidential information. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Capacity to communicate case information among Court units. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

(b) Comments on Communications and Coordination Adequacy

## 7. Technology

### (a) Adequacy of Technology Needed to Support Drug Court Case Processing

- A variety of different types of communications technology for linking Court personnel with different units, state and local databases, and other justice agencies. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records production and management technology. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Office technology, e.g. word processing, presentation software. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Computer workstations. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Case scheduling, tracking, and calendaring programs. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Access to fee and fines tracking software (this applies only to adult offenders). ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Message software, including triage software. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Risk and compliance assessment tools. ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- (b) Comments on Technology Adequacy

## 8. Equipment

### (a) Adequacy of Equipment

- Photocopiers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Furniture ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Telecommunications, FAX, printers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Word processing equipment ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Drug and UA testing equipment ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

- Data base access terminals ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- JALAN, and jail management system access ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- (b) Comments on Equipment Adequacy

## 9. Facilities

### (a) Adequacy of Facilities Needed to Support Drug Court Case Processing

- Common and private work and meeting spaces ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Substance use testing space ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Holding space for juvenile offenders ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Public information dissemination areas ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Courtrooms, hearings rooms, and judges chambers ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Records rooms and storage spaces ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate
- Waiting room and child care space ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

### (b) Comments on Facilities Adequacy